# PREAMBLE to resurrected Cases Z.N.(S.)1686, 1687 (see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 22 (2), pp. 102, 103)

These two cases are the last remaining from several originally submitted by Francis Hemming in 1964 under the old 'nomen oblitum rule' (Art. 23b), and shelved when that rule was placed in abeyance. Hemming had discovered those nomina oblita during his exhaustive research of the ancient generic names for his 1967 classic 'Generic Names of the Butterflies and their Type-Species' (Bull. Br. Mus. nat. Hist. (Ent.) Suppl. vol. 9), published three years after his death. The cases have been in suspense now for nearly 20 years; none of the older names have been adopted, and early settlement is requested in order to end present uncertainty and threats to stability.

C. F. COWAN

## EUPHAEDRA HÜBNER, [1819] (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)1686

(see Bull. zool. Nom. vol. 22 (2), p. 102)

By Charles F. Cowan (4 Thornfield Terrace, Grange-over-Sands, Cumbria LA11 7DR, England)

Euphaedra Hübner, [1819], type species by designation by Scudder, 1875, Papilio cyparissa Cramer, [1775], is the universally known name of an unusually large and colourful genus of Nymphalid butterflies in Africa. Unfortunately, when Hübner's Tentamen [1806] was suppressed by Opinion 97, one of the names he had used in it became technically available in a slightly different sense, as a senior subjective synonym of Euphaedra. That name is Najas Hübner, [1807], whose type species by monotypy, Najas themis Hübner, [1807], is currently considered to be congeneric with E. cyparissa (Cramer). The name Najas in this sense was quickly abandoned by Hübner and has never been adopted, while Euphaedra has remained in universal use for well over 100 years, ten recent examples being: Peters, 1952, pp. 63-66; van Someren & Jackson (1960), pp. 127-137, pls. 2-5; Gifford, 1965, p. 106; Pinhey, 1965, pp. 92–93; Hemming, 1967, pp. 179, 304; Cooper, 1973, p. 71; Lewis, 1973, pls. 100, 101; Laithwaite et al., 1975, p. 204, pl. 237 g; Pinhey & Loe, 1977, pp. 25, 26, 34, 36-37; Carcasson, 1981, pp. 45, 46, 165-167.

2. Euphaedra of present authors is ripe for 'splitting', but it so happens that the two type species involved here are very closely related (Nos. 2472, 2474 among over 80 species listed in the subgenus Euphaedra alone) and it is considered that to save Najas for any who 'think it a genus distinct from Euphaedra' would delay rather than assist stability.

3. The International Commission is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Najas* Hübner, [1807], for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy and, having done so:

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the generic name *Euphaedra* Hübner, [1819] (gender feminine), type-species by designation by Scudder, 1875, *Papilio cyparissa* Cramer, [1775],

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the specific name *cyparissa* Cramer, [1775], as published in the binomen *Papilio cyparissa* (type-species of *Euphaedra* 

Hübner, [1819]),

(4) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the generic name *Najas* Hübner, [1807], as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above.

### **ORIGINAL REFERENCES**

Euphaedra Hübner, [1819], Verzeichniss bekannter Schmettlinge, p. 39 Type Designation; Scudder, 1875. Proc. Amer. Acad, Arts Sci. vol. 10, p. 172

Papilio cyparissa Cramer, [1775], Uitlandsche Kapellen etc. vol. 1 (4),

p. 63, pl. 39 figs. D, E.

Najas, and N. themis Hübner, [1807]. Sammlung exotischer Schmettlinge vol. 1, pl. [60].

#### RECENT REFERENCES

CARCASSON, R. H. 1981. *Collins' Handguide to the Butterflies of Africa*. xix, 1–100 (col. figs throughout), 101–188 pp. 8°. London.

COOPER, R. 1973. Butterflies of Rhodesia. [6], 138 pp., 32 pls. 8°. (Longmans, Rhodesia), Salisbury.

GIFFORD, D. 1965. List of the Butterflies of Malawi, [7], i-vi, 1-148 pp., 9 pls. 8°. (Hist. Sci. Soc. Malawi), Blantyre.

HEMMING, F. 1967. The generic Names of the Butterflies and their Typespecies, *Bull. Br. Mus. nat. Hist.* (Entomol.) Suppl. vol. 9. 509 pp.

LEWIS, H. L. 1973. *Butterflies of the World*. xvi pp., 208 pls., pp. [2], 209–312. 4°. (Harrap) London.

LAITHWAITE, E., WATSON, A. & WHALLEY, P. E. S. 1975, Dictionary of Butterflies and Moths in Colour, xlviii pp., 144 pls., pp. 145–296, 4°. (Michael Joseph) London.

PETERS, W. 1952. Provisional Checklist of the Butterflies of the Ethiopian Region. [7], 9-201 pp. 8°. (Classey) Feltham.

PINHEY, E. C. G. 1965, Butterflies of Southern Africa, xi, 240 pp., 42 pls. 8°. (Longmans, Rhodesia) Salisbury.

- & LOE, 1, D. 1977. Guide to the Butterflies of Central and Southern Africa. 106 pp., illustr. Oblong 8°, (Causton & Sons) London,

VAN SOMEREN, V. G. L. & JACKSON, T. H. E. 1960. Some comments on Protective Resemblance amongst African Lepidoptera. J. Lepid. Soc. vol. 13 (1959) (3), pp. 121–150 (incl. 10 pls.).

## OUROCNEMIS BAKER, 1887 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)1687

(see Bull. zool. Nom. 22 (2), p. 103)

by Charles F. Cowan (4 Thornfield Terrace, Grange-over-Sands. Cumbria LA11 7DR. England)

Aetheius Hübner, [1819], was a generic name introduced for three species which Hübner placed among the Hesperiid ('Skipper') butterflies but which actually are all Riodinids ('Metalmarks'). By 1875 when Scudder designated the type species, the true affiliation of two was known, so he designated the third 'for it alone belongs to the group in which Hübner placed this genus'; Papilio archytas Stoll, [1787]. Thereafter, the name Aetheius disappeared from the literature, being rightly ignored by Hesperiid workers and never discovered by Riodinid specialists.

2. In 1887 Baker introduced the generic name Ourocnemis for the Riodinid species Anteros axiochus Hewitson, [1867], which is now considered subjectively to be conspecific with P. archytas Stoll. To resurrect the defunct name Aetheius now, sinking Ourocnemis which has been in continual use for nearly a century, would stretch the Law of Priority to extreme length at the expense of stability and universality. Recent usages of *Ourocnemis* are;

Lichy, 1936, p. 204, fig., & 1938, pl., fig. 4; Hall, 1940, p. 35; Forster, 1948, p. 111, no. 189; Hemming, 1967, p. 328; Ortiz, 1967, p. 14 (as "Aurocnemis"); Zikán & Zikán, 1968, p. 55; Tello, 1968, p. 220; Lamas, 1969, p. 318; Lewis, 1973, pl. 77, fig. 14 (as "Ourochnemis

archytes'); Biezanko et al, 1979, p. 16.

3. The International Commission is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress for the purposes of the